

MAYOR BRILEY. Well, there were two sides to this. As usual, the mayor gets caught in the middle of it. There were a group of people, a substantial number, about 45 percent of them were Negro businesses that had bought properties knowing they were going to relocate and were held up because the highway didn't go through.

Then there was the other group who were there and knew nothing about it, and were having to move what they called rather hastily, although this had been published as an existing or proposed road with the general alinement for at least 10 years, and I would say probably once a month, but no one said anything until the actual taking began to operate.

So, we had one group of people who were hung up in their relocation and had large sums of money committed, and they were just like the mayor, they were caught in the middle of the argument between the two groups.

Senator BAKER. I find, Mayor, that is not a situation left entirely to mayors. Mayor, you made reference, and I have asked you about, uniformity of procedures on condemnation of land and acquisitions.

There is one other aspect of that general situation that I would like to ask you about. Do you feel that we would be better served to approach this problem, the elaboration of the value of incidental damages in Tennessee, by appropriate amendments to the various statutes, or a consolidation of them, or the promulgation of a new statute, or by the implementation of that objective through usual Federal control?

Do you feel it could be done more effectively one way or another, or do you prefer that it be done both ways?

MAYOR BRILEY. With my limited knowledge, I think you will find that the eminent domain and the statutes in many States differ considerably, and it could be possible that there could be some provision of a Federal statute that would require, where Federal funds were involved, a certain standard that should be applied by State statutes in acquisition.

You will find not only Tennessee, but there are other States that have this similar problem.

Senator BAKER. If I may, just for a moment, Mr. Chairman. Mayor, I would like to ask you a question substantially the same as I asked Mrs. Spellman.

Do you foresee that consolidation of present systems of categorical grants-in-aid by the Federal Government in any way would diminish the desirability or impact of the desirability of elaborating a plan of bloc grants on a less restrictive basis, or a system of Federal revenue sharing?

MAYOR BRILEY. We take a view that there ought to be some degree of standards if Federal funds are being expended, that are being met in the comprehensive plan. You get into the difficulty with a block grant of turning it loose, and there are officials, unfortunately, that would not rely upon their own local resources to the extent that they ought to, to operate their own government. I think that we ought to have the responsible responsiveness to the problems of the community along with the assistance that we can get.

Let me give you just one illustration of what I mean. We have undertaken, as you know, in Nashville, a very comprehensive sewer program on a system which has been neglected for about 40 years, and in